



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

parliaments. In some countries the revolt means ultimate revolution, and revolution of a very desperate and sweeping kind, unless its demands are speedily heard.

In face of this rising protest of the people it is not strange that the authorities should pause and think. They can not choke the deficits; it is more perilous still to try to choke the people. Disarmament, then, is in the air. It is in the mouths of the people. It is on the pens of editors. It is reaching the war-ministers' ears. It is knocking at the doors of cabinets. The demand has even gone so far that men are asking, "How shall it be begun?" "Who will take the first step?" When these questions are asked the difficulty and delicacy of the problem become at once apparent. Europe has a huge elephant on its hands. How shall he be caged or slain? Everybody is afraid to tackle him, though he is stalking about swinging his trunk viciously and setting his big feet crushingly on everything which comes in his way.

As a step towards the real thing to be done, it has been proposed that the nations simply agree to call a halt and not go any further on the perilous road of armaments. Abstractly, that is, of course, the first thing to be done. Practically, it is not so simple. Some of the nations might say with a show of reason: "Our armaments are much inferior, proportionately, to those of others; wait till we get even, and then we will agree to stop." Another proposed method of commencing the solution is that of a truce for ten years, or until the close of the present century, during which the nations shall agree not to go to war and not to increase their armaments. The first part of this proposition, that is not to go to war for a certain specified time, would, if carried out, do very little to relieve the situation unless the second part of it, not to increase armaments, were carried out at the same time, and this would meet with the same objection which is given above. A third method proposed is to agree to reduce the time of service everywhere to one year. This would reduce the expenses of the service by possibly one-half and would leave the nations relatively just where they are, both as to the size of their armies and the efficiency of the discipline acquired. But this plan is likely to meet with the apparently grave objection that the efficiency of the discipline acquired in one year would very imperfectly compensate for the great expense incurred, and that it would be just as well to disband the armies outright. The method of gradual and proportionate disarmament which has been often talked of would meet with the same objection previously given, that some of the nations are much behind the others in their military development.

It is not our purpose in this article to outline what we might think to be the wisest way in which to proceed, but only to state the urgency of the problem and the difficulties in the way of its solution. These difficulties, as well as the problem itself, all spring ultimately out of the sentiments of ill feeling, or at least of fear and distrust,

which the nations bear toward each other. These must, in part at least, give way before the situation can in any way be relieved. We have no doubt that they are giving way, and this leads us to hope that something may be done at an early date. The wisest course and in fact the only one which can be taken at present is to follow the suggestion which is being urged in England of calling a Conference of the Powers to discuss the situation and to see what can be done. If the Governments will consent to meet together, by their representatives, and candidly and freely consider the situation, they will not be long in finding some practical way of disposing of the question, however difficult it may seem when looked at theoretically. Without such a Conference nothing can be done. One ought to be called at the earliest practicable date, in which men of wisdom from the different countries may meet together, without prejudice, without preconceived schemes which they are not willing to give up for better ones, and deliberate how they may relieve Europe from the curse which is fast blighting it. Such a Conference might find it wise to adopt some one of the methods of relief which have already been proposed, or some combination of them, or something still more radical and far-reaching, but if once convened it will be practically sure to find some solution which when tried will surprise us all with its simplicity and naturalness. B. F. T.

THE PERSONAL TESTIMONY OF WM. F. DAVIS IN BEHALF OF PEACE.

[Doubtless an army of considerable size could be gathered together of those who had been convinced of the unlawfulness and sinfulness of engaging in carnal warfare, through reading Dymond's excellent treatise upon that matter. Some remarks dropped by my friend, William F. Davis, of Boston, concerning the agency of Dymond's essay in helping him to correct views upon the subject, led me to request from him a statement thereupon. His response is appended. He has known what it is during the time since the war to battle bravely and faithfully under the banner of his Immanuel — notably in the lumber camps of Northern Wisconsin, and in Boston itself where, as we remember, he was treated to eleven months in jail for the offence of gathering a crowd by reading the Bible on that same historic common, which, upwards of two centuries ago, witnessed the hanging of four Friends for the testimony of Jesus.—*Josiah W. Leeds.*]

Early in 1861 I was employed in a cotton mill in South Carver, Massachusetts, by a firm entitled Jenkins Bros. & Co. My mother's older brother, Wm. Franklin Jenkins, after whom I was named, had been an intimate friend of Elihu Burritt, and from him, if I remember right, had received a copy of Jonathan Dymond's essays, among which was the essay on war, which I read in the year 1860 with profound interest, as the book had been

given to me after my uncle's early death a few years before.

My grandparents and parents were ardent abolitionists, and my heart beat true to anti-slavery sentiments. Hence I held in very high esteem the utterances of Garrison and Rogers, and Phillips and Whittier, and I ignorantly supposed they were all as much opposed to war as to slavery. At the sudden outburst of our civil war early in the year 1861, I instinctively felt that slavery on this continent was doomed, and that the war must somehow inevitably destroy our covenant with death and agreement with hell. Yet I felt no call to enlist in Massachusetts militia companies, over which Benjamin F. Butler was appointed Colonel. Until then, Butler had been regarded as the most audacious of all our Democratic lawyers in the North. By a clever political somersault he suddenly threw himself forward and came up a Republican shouter and war-chief; and while men were prophesying that soon he would execute a back somersault and carry over recruits into the camp of the "Copperheads," he was leading Massachusetts troops through Baltimore, and offering by their aid to assist a Governor of a Southern State to put down any slave insurrection that might arise(!) These tidings made both our ears tingle. At the same time a rumor reached us, that young John Brown, son of the whilom John Brown who was the terror of American slavery, was in Boston, quietly recruiting volunteers to go down South and aid the slaves to gain their freedom.

Perhaps the wish of many and the fear of more that this might be the case, was the source and the substance of this rumor. Meanwhile Wendell Phillips had flamed forth before a huge mass-meeting of excited sympathizers in a clarion call to war. He urged the North at once to raise five hundred thousand soldiers and sweep the slave States into the Gulf of Mexico. Thus the question of where to plant and how to uphold both anti-slavery and peace standards in the midst of the clashing hurricanes of war, was beset with some difficulties for a young man yet under twenty-one years of age. If I could fight conscientiously at all with carnal weapons, I thought it would be under some John Brown leadership.

During these mental exercises I read with surprise Wendell Phillips' war speech as reported in the *Boston Journal*. I had incorrectly classified him with the non-resistants, Foster and others. Doubtless my error was due to the hasty inference that their united labors at Anti-Slavery conventions was only a single article of a covenant wide-reaching and many-sided. I was curious to know what cogent arguments had forced him out of the peace position which I mistakenly supposed he had previously held. Accordingly I wrote a short letter of inquiry. He was very courteous to reply at all to such a raw stripling. He was doubly courteous in that he answered promptly, and at length.

He said, "Do not defer to me nor to any other man.

Read and think for thyself." He recommended the New Testament and Dymond's Essay on the Peace side of the subject, as best. He rehearsed the familiar arguments of self-defence on the War side. Until then I had been too much inclined to hero-worship. I continued to hold Phillips in much esteem, but the idolatrous spell was broken. Christ and Peace reigned in my heart; and while I clearly recognized the necessity and functions of law in governments, terrestrial and celestial, and that the sword wielded by the legal magistrate is not in vain, as a minister of Christ in a dispensation of grace, I feel no call to take the sword.

Sincerely thy brother in Christ,

WILLIAM F. DAVIS.

DECORATION DAY.

To-day's celebration is not a tribute to war but to self sacrifice. Neither the strains of martial music nor the rhetoric of the orator should be permitted to hide the fact that war is the greatest curse that ever afflicted mankind; it is worse than famine and pestilence; for it not only takes life and pierces the heart with grief, but it nourishes the ugliest and fiercest human passions.

It was nothing but the instinct of a savage that led Von Moltke to eulogize war as one of the greatest agencies of civilization. The struggles of the battlefield may have rid the world of many unfit men and nations; but they have, at the same time, destroyed the strongest and bravest, for these are the ones that rush to the front and receive the deadliest blows of the enemy. They may have cultivated courage, but it was the courage of the tiger, incapable of sympathy and finding the greatest joy in the misfortunes of others. It is possible that they have led to a greater respect for the rights of others, since resistance to aggression tends always to discourage aggression: but some of the most peaceful tribes on the earth — tribes that have no knowledge of the art of war, exhibit the most deference for the rights of others. Although low in the intellectual scale, they practise all those virtues that militant peoples constantly laud in their maxims and habitually disregard in their actions.

There is not a virtue that the eulogists of war have attributed to it that the arts of peace do not draw forth. There are innumerable virtues born of peace that war invariably blasts. Not a day passes over a man's head that he is not called upon to exhibit courage, perseverance and self-sacrifice. Was it not Emerson who said a man had not lived who had not each day conquered some difficulty? Did not Wagner typify the same thought in the victory of Siegfried over the dragon? For most people, the slaughter of dragons is a daily task — often an hourly task. The beasts require a moral courage that no barbaric Siegfried ever felt. They develop a character as much above that of Wagner's hero as his was above the creature he slew. The man that does battle in behalf of some despised but humane cause; that dares to defend the truth when others forsake her; that seeks to deliver the government of his city or country from the brigands that prey upon it — he is a type of character that finds no parallel in mythology or among the heroes of military history. In him exists the feeling of sympathy — the richest and choicest product of civilization. While they fight for plun-